

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE - AGENDA

February 3, 1981

UU 220

3:00 PM

Chair, Timothy Kersten
Vice Chair, Rod Keif
Secretary, John Harris

I. Minutes

II. Announcements

III. Reports

Academic Council (Keif)
Administrative Council (Harris)
CSUC Academic Senate (Hale, Riedlsperger, Weatherby)
Foundation Board (Kersten)
President's Council (Kersten)

IV. Committee Reports

Budget (Conway)	General Education and Breadth (Wenzl)
Constitution and Bylaws (O'Toole)	Instruction (Brown)
Curriculum (Harris)	Long Range Planning (Simmons)
Distinguished Teaching Award (Fierstine)	Personnel Policies (Goldenberg)
Election (Al-Hadad)	Personnel Review (Duarte)
Faculty Library (Swansen)	Research (Dingus)
Fairness Board (Rosenman)	Student Affairs (Moran)

V. Business Items

- A. Resolution Regarding University Resources and Controversial Information (Beecher) (Second Reading)
- B. Resolution on Physical Education Department Curriculum (Harris) (First Reading)
- C. Resolution Regarding Enrollment Quota Determination (Conway) (First Reading)
- D. Resolution Regarding Space and Facility Allocation (Conway) (First Reading)
- E. Resolution Regarding Grade Definitions and Guidelines (Brown) (First Reading)

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-111-81/EC
November 18, 1980

RESOLUTION REGARDING UNIVERSITY RESOURCES AND CONTROVERSIAL INFORMATION

Background: During the course of the last summer quarter, President Baker used the resources of his office to distribute material published by an off-campus organization. After several faculty members questioned the propriety of themailing, President Baker explained that "one of the most important reasons for the existence of a university is to provide a forum for constructive criticism of our culture." He added that if necessary to provide balance in that discussion, university facilities, at the Department and School level as well as the resources of President Baker's office, could be used to disseminate pertinent information.

RESOLVED: The university should encourage the discussion of religious, political, public or civic affairs, or other non-ballot controversies. On occasion the President may wish to use his office in order to disseminate information necessary to provide a balanced discussion of these issues. Prior to the distribution of the relevant information, the President shall consult with a subcommittee of the Academic Senate comprised of three members of the Executive Committee regarding the appropriateness of the materials in question.

THE ACADEMIC SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING COURSE PROPOSALS
FROM THE SCHOOL OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION

T=title	U=units	M=mode
D=description	PR=prerequisite	
P=prefix	N=number	

Physical Education

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|----------------------------------|----------|
| 1. PE 276 | The Human Element of Sport (3) | New | Approved |
| 2. PE 402 | Introduction to Motor Learning (3) | New | Approved |
| 3. | <u>Health Option:</u> | | |
| | Delete: SP 217 (4) Essentials | | |
| | Delete: CD 108 (3) or Soc 206 (3) | | |
| | Addition: Geography 320 Geography of Hunger (3) | | |
| | Addition: Biology 253 Orientation to the Health Profession (1) | | |
| | Addition: Sociology 344 Sociology of Poverty (3) | | |
| | Addition: Child Development 447 Adulthood and Aging (3) | | |
| 4. | <u>General Education and Breadth:</u> | | |
| | PSc 101 to PSc | | |
| | PSc 102 to PSc | | |
| | Freshman - Senior Curriculum in P.E. Catalog Display Change | | |
| | (rearrangement of P.E. units) | | |
| | Athletic Coaching Option | <u>Catalog Display Change</u> | |
| | Health Education Option | <u>Catalog Display Change</u> | |
| | Teaching Option | <u>Catalog Display Change</u> | |
| 5. | PE 401 Organization and Administration of Health and Physical Education (3) | <u>Course Description Change</u> | |
| 6. | PE 406 Adaptive Physical Education (3) | <u>Course Description Change</u> | |
| 7. | PE 407 Adapted PE Program Development | <u>New Course Insertion</u> | |
| 8. | Private/Public Fitness Certificate | <u>Department Display Change</u> | |
| 9. | Dance Certificate | <u>Department Display Change</u> | |

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-105-80/BC
November 18, 1980

RESOLUTION CONCERNING ENROLLMENT QUOTA DETERMINATION

- WHEREAS, The determination of enrollment quotas and long-range enrollment guidelines for each school at this univeristy is potentially the single most important decision affecting the character, quality and operation of the University; and
- WHEREAS, Shifts in enrollment quotas from lower cost programs to higher cost programs, and vice versa, affect the allocation of resources at the university, particularly in a time of limited resources; and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate had been consulted directly in the annual review of the college growth rate and distribution of enrollment by school (AB 71-1); and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate is now only indirectly involved in the annual review process consultation via informal contact through the President's Council Meetings (AB 74-3, revised); and
- WHEREAS, Enrollment quotas have not been discussed at the President's Council Meetings this year, and a decision on this matter must be made between November 1 and November 15 of each year (AB 74-3, revised); and
- WHEREAS, It is realized that the prime responsibility for setting enrollment targets and guidelines rests with the university president (AB 74-3, revised); therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That whenever policy decisions are to be made concerning enrollment quotas and long-range enrollment guidelines, formal consultation should occur between the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and a representative of the university administration. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will then decide if further consultation on the part of the Senate is required, and route it to the appropriate committees for action.

BACKGROUND MATERIAL CONCERNING BUDGET COMMITTEE'S SPACE ALLOCATION
RESOLUTION:

The amount of space allocated to an instructional program at Cal Poly is determined by state formulas involving FTE(Full Time Equivalent Students) and FTEF(Full Time Equivalent Faculty Members) generated by each school. The average is about 3.5 square feet per FTE, according to Executive Dean Douglas Gerard. Figures concerning FTE and FTEF are determined for the campus each March, and are submitted to the board of trustees along with campus proposals for major and minor capital outlay programs. These proposals are developed through consultation between the President, Executive Vice President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President's Council, and the Executive Dean. No consultation takes place presently with the Academic Senate or its committees(i.e., Long Range Planning and Budget Committees) concerning space allocation at Cal Poly.

Important decisions affecting the instructional program are made at the University level involving the allocation of space, both in new construction and in renovated buildings on campus. A rank ordered priority list is developed on campus concerning both major and minor (projects costing less than \$100,000.00) capital outlay programs. Also use of renovated space(existing facilities which become vacant due to new construction - i.e., Dexter Library and Chase Hall) is determined by the University administration.

A current example of the renovation concept can be seen in the allocation of space in the old Dexter Library with the move into the Robert E. Kennedy library scheduled over quarter break before winter quarter begins. Only two general purpose classrooms are planned for this building, a building which the Chancellor's Office statewide restriction against the construction of general classroom facilities(as quoted in AB 74-3) does not apply to. Although, according to Dean Gerard, 'there is no shortage of general classroom facilities at the University, when the whole academic day is considered,' some questions could be asked. Could we replace some of the inadequate general classroom facilities, which are now utilized, by better ones in the Dexter Library complex? Why are only two general classroom facilities being considered for perhaps the only building in the foreseeable future, where a significant number of general purpose classroom facilities could be constructed? The new Engineering South Building, the next major construction project for the campus, will only have two general purpose classrooms built into it. This is only one issue that could be raised, if the Academic Senate by way of its committees was consulted in the space allocation decision making process.

The timeliness of the issue is apparent from the impacted status of the University, which makes space allocation an even more important concern. Therefore the following resolution is presented calling for consultation between the administration and the Academic Senate concerning space and facility allocation at the University.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-106-80/BC
November 18, 1980

RESOLUTION ON CONSULTATION IN SPACE ALLOCATION

- WHEREAS, The allocation of space and facilities on a university campus comprises a significant resource; and
- WHEREAS, This resource becomes even more important when the university campus, like Cal Poly's, faces an impacted status for several years; and
- WHEREAS, Some flexibility and discretion exists at the local campus level in the CSUC system concerning the allocation of this resource; and
- WHEREAS, The allocation of this resource impinges directly upon the quality of the instructional programs at Cal Poly; and
- WHEREAS, Currently the faculty at Cal Poly, who have the primary responsibility for instruction, have minimal input into the space allocation process via the Academic Senate and its committees, therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the administration of California Polytechnic State University should engage in meaningful consultation with the Academic Senate via the Executive Committee, and appropriate subordinate committees, as deemed necessary by the Executive Committee, whenever decisions are being made concerning current or future space allocation on the campus.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-109-81/IC
January 6, 1981

RESOLUTION REGARDING GRADE DEFINITIONS AND GUIDELINES

Background: Over the last several years a number of studies of the grading system have resulted in recommendations that the definitions of the letter grade system be revised. The proper role of the letter grade system is to allow a shorthand evaluation of student performance that can be easily interpreted. Both the CSUC Academic Senate and the Cal Poly Task Force on Grade Inflation have recommended that the definitions of the letter grades be made more operational and that they be more closely coupled to levels of attainment of course objectives. During the Spring Quarter of 1980, the Academic Council passed a resolution suggesting that all faculty include in course syllabi such information as course objectives and methods of evaluation, where appropriate. Such course descriptions allow each instructor to establish grading criteria and to relate measures of performance to course objectives.

- WHEREAS, The letter grade serves several purposes which include evaluating the student for retention and progress toward graduation and informing the student regarding his/her level of achievement of the learning and performance objectives established for the course; and
- WHEREAS, The University has already identified that normal progress toward graduation requires maintenance of at least a "C" average; and
- WHEREAS, The broad range of courses and activities encountered at the University and the variety of teaching styles will lead to very different evaluation methods and grading criteria for different courses and instructors; and
- WHEREAS, The level of performance or understanding in a course or activity may indicate the level of preparation for a subsequent course; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the catalog definitions of the letter grades should be revised to include the following:

- A - Excellent attainment of course objectives. An exceptional performance.
- B - High level of achievement of course objectives. This level of performance is well above that required for progress toward graduation or for continuation in courses for which this course is a prerequisite.
- C - Satisfactory achievement of course objectives. A level of performance which is acceptable for progress toward graduation and for enrollment in subsequent courses for which this course is a prerequisite.
- D - Achieves course objectives at only a minimum or perfunctory level. A minimum passing performance. An accumulation of such grades can result in academic disqualification from the university. It is recommended that this course be repeated prior to enrollment in a subsequent course for which this course is a prerequisite.
- F - Fails to achieve course objectives at a minimum level. An unacceptable performance which does not meet requirements for credit toward graduation.
- Cr - Achievement of course objectives at least at the level of acceptability required for progress toward graduation and for enrollment in subsequent courses for which this course is a prerequisite.
- NC - Does not achieve course objectives at a level of acceptability required for progress toward graduation. This course must be repeated prior to enrollment in a course for which this course is a prerequisite.

No single set of criteria for evaluating students can be applied to all courses. Standards must be developed for each course in accordance with the objectives of that course. Each faculty member is encouraged to identify the course objectives and the criteria to be used to determine the level of achievement of those objectives for each course that he/she teaches.